RETALIATORY OR RESPONSIVE EVENTS

Continued

March 20, 2026 — Hotel Entry, Property Loss, Unidentified Welfare Contact, and Traffic Stop

On March 20, my family and I departed North Carolina for Arizona. During the trip, we checked into a Marriott hotel.

While we were away from the room, the room was entered. Approximately $500 in cash and a tablet were later determined to be missing.

During the same hotel stay, a woman identifying herself as affiliated with an organization called the “Child Protective Network” attempted to gain entry to the room because my young son was crying. Her identity, employer, and authority were not established during the encounter.

During a later traffic stop, a Tennessee State Trooper advised us that he had received a welfare-related call concerning our child. The trooper evaluated the situation and identified no concern involving our son. We informed him of the woman who had attempted to enter the hotel room. According to my recollection of the encounter, the trooper stated that he was unaware of an agency called the “Child Protective Network” and did not know the woman’s identity.

The hotel-room entry, missing property, attempted welfare contact, and subsequent welfare call occurred during the same period of travel. I cannot establish whether these events were connected to one another or to my investigation. They are grouped here because of their proximity in time, their occurrence shortly after the public whistleblower notice and travel announcements, and the availability of supporting documentation for independent review.

March 23, 2026 — Removal of Published Travel Documentation

On March 23, during the return portion of the travel investigation, I posted a video documenting my arrival and contemporaneous observations.

The video was removed from my TikTok account but remained available on another profile where it had also been posted. This difference was documented because it indicated that the file itself remained viewable elsewhere while becoming unavailable from my account.

The reason for the removal has not been independently established. This report does not determine whether the removal resulted from platform moderation, an account-specific process, a technical error, or another cause.

March 30–April 2, 2026 — Public Allegations and Follow-Up Evidence

On March 30, I publicly offered a $500 reward for information identifying the woman who had represented herself as affiliated with the “Child Protective Network.” I also publicly alleged that military exercises may have been used to conceal UAP-related intercept activity and avoid mandatory reporting.

On March 31, I confirmed the loss of approximately $500 and a tablet from the hotel room during the same stay in which the unidentified woman attempted to gain entry.

On April 2, during a recorded conversation, the Marriott manager confirmed that hotel employees had spoken with the woman. This differed from statements made during the original encounter indicating that hotel personnel did not know who she was.

The recorded conversation is included because it supplies documentary support that the woman interacted with hotel personnel. It does not, by itself, establish her identity, authority, purpose, or relationship to the missing property or welfare call.

April 3, 2026 — Comprehensive Disclosure and Change in Observed Response

On April 3, I published a comprehensive video summarizing the aerial observations, interstate travel, and related events documented up to that date. Representative Anna Paulina Luna was tagged in the publication.

The same day, I conducted an experiment using a walkie-talkie configured to a ham-radio setting. I read portions of the whistleblower report aloud while observing aerial activity. During the transmission, I recorded multiple drones appearing to stop or change orientation toward my location.

After April 3, I no longer observed the same type of apparent drone response to my actions that had been documented during earlier observation periods.

This sequence is included because the apparent behavioral change occurred contemporaneously with a comprehensive public disclosure and a deliberate experiment. The observations do not independently establish that the drones received, understood, or responded to the transmission, nor do they establish who operated them.

April 4–11, 2026 — Washington Travel Notices and Account Anomaly

Beginning April 4, I publicly announced my intention to travel to Washington, D.C. I subsequently issued a series of countdown notices before the planned departure.

On April 6, after signing into my CapCut account, I discovered that CapCut Pro access appeared to have been enabled despite my not knowingly purchasing a subscription or initiating a free trial. Several hours later, I received a renewal notification displaying a dash rather than a monetary amount.

After I discussed the incident publicly and raised privacy concerns, I later observed that CapCut’s published policy included language acknowledging that some users might unexpectedly receive Pro access.

Screenshots and dated posts were preserved. I have not independently established why access was enabled, whether the policy language had existed elsewhere previously, or whether the account event was connected to my investigation.

On April 9, I issued a five-day public notice and supplied a telephone number through which governmental personnel or other interested parties could contact me concerning the documented observations. I received no contact.

On April 11, I departed earlier than the date or time implied by the public announcements.

April 12, 2026 — Vehicle and Recording Anomalies in the Washington Metropolitan Area

On April 12, my family visited Gravelly Point near Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. Our vehicle remained parked while we were away for approximately 45 minutes. Upon returning, I found the driver’s-side window rolled down.

The vehicle did not have remote or smart-window controls, and no other property appeared disturbed. I cannot determine how or why the window was lowered.

Later that evening, while documenting aerial activity in Alexandria, Virginia, I experienced two instances in which my camera stopped recording as a low-altitude drone passed overhead. Photographs were nevertheless obtained during the encounters, and the interrupted recording files were preserved.

The recording interruptions are included because they occurred during close aerial encounters and affected efforts to preserve evidence. The available evidence does not establish whether the interruptions resulted from equipment malfunction, storage limitations, user operation, environmental conditions, electromagnetic interference, or another cause.

April 14, 2026 — Congressional Production Deadline

On April 14, the Department of Defense reached the reported deadline for providing requested UAP-related videos to Representative Anna Paulina Luna.

A low-altitude helicopter was also observed over the reporting area that afternoon. The overflight is documented in the chronology because of its timing, but this report does not establish a relationship between the helicopter and the congressional deadline.

Summary

The events summarized in this section include:

- Loss or removal of digital material intended for publication.
- Unusual or unidentified contacts following travel announcements or whistleblower disclosures.
- Entry into a hotel room and loss of property.
- An attempted welfare-related hotel-room entry by a person whose identity and authority were not established.
- A subsequent child-welfare call resulting in no adverse finding.
- Differences between initial hotel representations and later recorded confirmation.
- Unexplained account access or subscription activity.
- A vehicle-window event during publicly announced travel.
- Recording interruptions during close aerial observations.
- Changes in observed activity following public disclosures and investigative experiments.

Considered individually, several of these events may have ordinary or unrelated explanations. Considered collectively and in chronological relationship to the investigation, they were sufficiently unusual to preserve and present for independent evaluation. This section does not resolve motive, coordination, institutional involvement, or causation.